



Xerox Docket No. D/98439C

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Douglas N. CURRY

Group Art Unit: 2624

Application No.: 10/025,671

Examiner: A. Do

Filed: December 26, 2001

Docket No.: 101256.01

For: A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DIRECTED ACUITY SEGMENTATION
RESOLUTION COMPRESSION AND DECOMPRESSION

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

RECEIVED

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

JUL 10 2003
Technology Center 2600

Sir:

In reply to the June 13, 2003 Office Action, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Applicant appreciates the Office Action's indication that claims 7 and 10-12 are allowed.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested, in view of the following remarks.

Applicant thanks Examiner Do for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative, Mr. Luo, during the June 20, 2003 personal interview. The substance of the June 20 personal interview is incorporated in the remarks below.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,774,634 to Honma et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,389,176 to Hsu et al. and U.S. Patent 5,487,172 to Hyatt. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action admits that Honma does not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge. However, the Office Action asserts that Hsu discloses removing pixels from an edge, and that Hyatt discloses removing pixels along a horizontal direction parallel to the edge while selecting pixels along the vertical direction perpendicular to the edge. Applicant respectfully submits that Honma, Hsu and Hyatt, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge, as recited in claims 1-6, 8 and 9.

As discussed in the December 19, 2002 personal interview, and in the December 30, 2002 and April 2, 2003 Amendments, Hsu discloses extracting objects using dilation and erosion operations. See col. 5, lines 19-20. While the dilation operation adds pixels to the boundaries of edges, the erosion operation removes pixels from the boundaries. See col. 5, lines 20-25. Hsu does not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge as recited in claims 1-6, 8 and 9. Therefore, Hsu does not supply the subject matter admitted as lacking in Honma.

As discussed at the June 20, 2003 personal interview, Hyatt discloses filling pixels between the prior edge and the next edge of a moving surface. See Fig. 9J and col. 204, lines 63-65. Hyatt discloses determining adjacent edge pixels. See Fig. 9J and col. 205, line 60 – col. 206, line 1. Adjacency may be direct adjacency, such as with an adjacent pixel actually in contact with an edge pixel, or may be adjacent pixels removed one or more pixels from the edge pixel. See Fig. 9J and col. 206, lines 1-19.

The Office Action asserts that Hyatt discloses, at Fig. 9J and col. 206, lines 4-9 and lines 21-34, removing pixels 972 and 983 along a horizontal direction parallel to the edge. Applicant respectfully submits that this text does not disclose or suggest discarding pixels. In

particular, as discussed during the June 20 personal interview, the word "remove" used in Hyatt means a distance from a certain position, and does not mean to discard. Hyatt clearly describes, at Fig. 9J and col. 206, lines 4-9, "if pixel 982 along a scan line is an edge pixel, a pixel directly adjacent thereto along the horizontal line will be pixel 981, and adjacent pixel once-removed along the horizontal scan line will be pixel 972, and an adjacent pixel twice-removed along the horizontal scan line will be pixel 983, and so on." Nowhere does Hyatt disclose or suggest that the term "remove" in any way refers to discarding pixels.

For at least the above reasons, Hyatt does not disclose or suggest discarding pixels in the direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge, as recited in claims 1-6, 8 and 9. Thus, Hyatt does not supply the subject matter outlined above as lacking in Honma and Hsu. Therefore, Honma, Hsu and Hyatt, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1-6, 8 and 9. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Honma in view of the prior art disclosed in the application (APA) and Hyatt. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action admits that Honma does not disclose or suggest using extra resolution in a direction perpendicular to an edge of marks to provide the high resolution data containing non-continuous tone data, and discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge. However, the Office Action asserts that the APA discloses providing high spatial resolution data containing non-continuous tone data using extra resolution across edges of marks, and that Hyatt discloses removing/discarding pixels along a horizontal direction parallel to the edge while selecting/remaining pixels along a vertical direction perpendicular to the edge. Applicant

respectfully submits that Honma, the APA and Hyatt, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge, as recited in claims 15-17.

As discussed in the December 19, 2002 personal interview, and in the December 30, 2002 and April 2, 2003 Amendments, the APA discloses that a human viewer appreciates non-continuous tone art information and continuous tone art information differently. The APA does not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge, as recited in claims 15-17. Therefore, the APA does not supply the subject matter admitted as lacking in Honma.

As discussed in the June 20, 2003 personal interview, Hyatt discloses determining adjacent pixels of an edge pixel. As discussed above, Hyatt discloses that adjacency may be direct adjacency, such as with an adjacent pixel actually in contact with an edge pixel, or may be adjacent pixels removed one or more pixels from the edge pixel. Hyatt does not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge, as recited in claims 15-17. Therefore, Hyatt does not supply the subject matter outlined above as lacking in Honma and the APA.

For at least the above reasons, Honma, the APA and Hyatt, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 15-17. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 13, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,026,196 to Shannon et al. in view of Hyatt. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action admits that Shannon does not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge. However, the Office Action asserts that Hyatt discloses this feature. Applicant

respectfully submits that Shannon and Hyatt, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge, as recited in claims 13, 14 and 18.

As discussed above, Hyatt discloses determining adjacent pixels to an edge pixel. Adjacency may be direct adjacency, such as with an adjacent pixel actually in contact with an edge pixel, or may be adjacent pixels removed one or more pixels from the edge pixel, as discussed in the June 20 personal interview. Hyatt does not disclose or suggest discarding pixels along a direction parallel to an edge while maintaining pixels along a direction perpendicular to the edge, as recited in claims 13, 14 and 18. Therefore, Hyatt does not supply the subject matter admitted as lacking in Shannon.

For at least the above reasons, Shannon and Hyatt, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 13, 14 and 18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/ale

Date: July 8, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension ' necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--